

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of May 28, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-14, 16-18 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11, 16 have been withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 18 have been amended. Claims 3, 13-14, 17 have been canceled. Claim 19 has been added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Offringa et al., of record.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by ABB (W02/103882).

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Akira Hosaka (W02/073788).

Claims 3, 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ABB in view of Worley et al., of record.

Claims 8, 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Akira Hosaka.

Applicant has amended claim 8 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 17. Claim 19 has been added to set forth the direct attachment of the magnets to the first carrier. Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly set forth the close configuration of the module as attained by the first and second carriers, as shown in Fig. 4, for accommodation of the permanent magnets. Claims 5, 10, 12, 18 have been amended to make them dependent on claim 8.

As a consequence of the incorporation of claim 17 in claim 8, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) become moot.

The present invention, as set forth in claim 8, now on file, is directed to permanent magnet module which includes a plurality of neighboring permanent magnets which are placed between first and second carriers, with an intermediate

space between neighboring permanent magnets being filled with a casting compound.

The Akira Hosaka reference describes a magnetic motor having a rotor equidistantly divided in a circumferential direction into a plurality of regions, with each region including a portion accommodating a plurality of permanent magnets in the circumferential direction, and a portion with no permanent magnets (cf. abstract of parallel EP 1 369 986 which corresponds to W02/073788). Apart from the fact that Akira Hosaka fails to show the arrangement of neighboring permanent magnets between a non-conducting first carrier and second carrier of soft magnetic material, Akira Hosaka also fails to show the presence of a casting compound in the intermediate spaces between neighboring magnets.

The ABB reference describes the arrangement of a plurality of permanent magnets (10) which are partly surrounded by a protective cover (11) to form a structure that is fastened to an electrotechnical device, such as a rotor (12) of an electric machine. ABB not only fails to disclose the presence of a second carrier of soft magnetic material but also fails to provide a casting compound in the space between neighboring permanent magnets. Figs. 1, 2, 3 of ABB clearly show a void between neighboring magnets. The assertion by the Examiner on page 2, last two lines of the Office Action, relating to the presence of a casting compound, is incorrect.

The Worley reference, which has been applied in combination with ABB, also fails to show the presence of a casting compound in the intermediate space between neighboring permanent magnets.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Akira Hosaka nor ABB, nor Worley et al., nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 8.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 8, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further applied prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent For Applicant  
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: August 26, 2008  
708 Third Avenue  
Suite 1501  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
(212)244-5500  
HMF:be